

REMARKS

After entry of this amendment, claims 25-45 are pending.

Applicants respectfully submit that the remarks presented in the Response to Final Action filed August 17, 2005 remain valid, and incorporate them herein by reference. Applicants respond to the Advisory Action mailed September 2, 2005 below.

The Advisory Action states that the Examiner interprets the application on the first computer as the first process of claim 25 and the application on the second computer as the first application comprising one or more second processes (see Advisory Action, page 2, last paragraph). The Advisory Action goes on to state that the operating system is the operating system on the first computer (see Advisory Action, page 3, last paragraph, extending to page 4) and that the external name service/storage device is interposed between the operating system on the first computer and the application on the second computer.

Applicants respectfully disagree with this analysis, but have nevertheless amended claim 25 for clarification. Applicants respectfully submit that Gamache does not teach or suggest "initiating a first process on a computer...the first process registering the virtual IP address and the virtual hostname with a software module on the computer, wherein the software module is interposed between the first application and an operating system on the computer, the first application executing on the operating system on the computer during use ... the first process initiating at least one of the one or more second processes of the first application on the computer".

Similarly, Gamache does not teach or suggest "A computer readable medium storing a plurality of instructions which, when executed as a first process on a computer: register a unique virtual IP address and a virtual hostname assigned to a first application on the computer with a software module interposed between the first application and an operating system on the computer; and initiate at least one of one or more second processes of the first application on the operating system on the computer, wherein the at

least one second process inherits the virtual IP address and the virtual hostname from the first process on the computer" as recited in claim 39.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully disagree that Gamache's teachings of an application name used to identify the dependency tree corresponds to the "first application identifier" in claim 26, wherein the application identifier is inherited. The application name is used to locate the dependency tree in Gamache, and thus cannot be inherited through the dependency tree. For similar reasons, Applicants submit that claim 40 is patentable over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5760-22700/LJM.

Respectfully submitted,



Lawrence J. Merkel

Reg. No. 41,191

AGENT FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.

P.O. Box 398

Austin, TX 78767-0398

Phone: (512) 853-8800

Date: 9/12/05